

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of September 9, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-15, 18, 20-22, 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung in view of Hsokawa et al. Claims 6, 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung and Hosokawa et al in view of Trusheim et al. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung and Hosokawa et al in view of Satoh. Claims 16, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung and Hosokawa et al in view of McGovern et al.

Claims 1-28 remain in this application. Independent claims 1, 12 and 25 have been amended in order to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. However, applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Brief Description

The disclosure relates to a method and system of secure data file erasure and confirmation. The claimed invention is a system and method for providing a status report following the request for the destruction of files. A user or system administrator can select a quantity of and pattern to be used in overwrites of the data file so that no one can recover the data from the storage medium.

The Cited Art

Kung (Patent No. 5,265,159), cited by the Examiner, teaches a method of securely deleting a file on a storage medium of a computer system. Kung uses an encryption algorithm to encrypt the data in the stored file prior to a conventional deletion process. If the user does not expect to undelete the information, a one-way encryption algorithm is used to increase the speed of secure deletion of the file.

Hosokawa (Patent No. 6,061,149), cited by the Examiner, teaches a communication system capable of changing communication protocol. The communication system can transmit and receive information with a destination via a communication line. The invention

includes a connection confirmee, an operability acquirer, a controller, a receiver and a data transferor.

The Claims as amended are Patentably Distinguished Over the Cited References.

Examiner will appreciate that independent claims 1, 12 and 25 have been amended to include the limitation that the secure storage medium eraser further comprises an overwrite algorithm. The remaining independent claim, claim 22, currently has the limitation that the data file be overwritten. Kung teaches a system of deletion that does not overwrite the data file. Kung discloses a system that uses encryption as its form of deletion. Moreover, Kung expressly teaches away from systems that overwrite data files as their form of deletion. Kung states that conventional methods of file deletion require a user to overwrite 0's and 1's over the data file as to remove any magnetic remnants of the removed information. Kung goes on to state that "this method is slow because the system must write 0's and 1's many times to ensure that the stored information cannot be recovered." Kung Col. 1, Lines 24-29. Hosokawa, the other cited reference, does not disclose any form of data deletion, much less overwriting data files as a form of data deletion. As such, claims 1, 12, 22 and 25 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references, and are now in proper condition for allowance. Because all other claims depend from claims 1, 12, 22 or 25 all other claims should also be in proper condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-28) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

Jan 9, 2006

Date

Patrick R. Roche

Patrick R. Roche
Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582